UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/689,687 | 10/22/2003 | Bas Ording | 001580-950 | 4912 |

21839 7590 11/28/2006

BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| CARLETON, THUY T | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2196 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/689,687 | ORDING ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Thuy Carleton | 2196 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-64* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-64* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *04/13/2004 and 02/24/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-64 are pending in this application and have been examined.

### *Double Patenting*

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. **Claims 1-64** are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10, 13-15, 17-20, 22-25, 28-33, 36-58, 60-65 and 67-69 of copending **Application No.10/465,855**, herein after "855". Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application is a narrower version of the limitations in ('855).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. **Claim 1** of the instant application corresponds to claims 1 and 2 of (`855). Both are directed to repositioning all open windows in a group of windows to appear in a respective area of a display without overlap while maintaining the relative sizes and configurations of the windows.

5. **Claim 30** of the instant application corresponds to claims 37 of (`855). Both are directed to repositioning all open windows in a group of windows to appear in a respective area of a display without overlap while maintaining the relative sizes and configurations of the windows.

6. **Claim 44** of the instant application corresponds to claim 53 and 54 of (`855). Both are directed to repositioning all open windows in a group of windows to appear in a respective area of a display without overlap.

7. **Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51** and **52** of the instant application correspond to claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 48, 49, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60 and 61 of (`855) respectively.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

**As to claim 38**, a "program" is being recited; however, as disclosed by the specification sections are taught to be software, per se. A program with no structural and functional interrelationship between computer elements is computer software by itself.

**As such, claims 39-40** are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-19, 23-28, 30-40, 44-48 and 50-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Southgate (US Patent 5,561,757).

**As claim 1**, Southgate teaches a method of providing an alternative view of a group of open windows on a display for a graphical user interface (abstract), comprising the steps of: in response to a command to present the alternative view (col. 6, lines 58-60), repositioning all open windows of said group so that they appear in a respective area of the display without overlap (col. 3, lines 38-42) while maintaining the relative sizes and configurations of the windows in said group (col. 3, lines 42-45 and col. 8, lines 6-13);
and subsequently returning the windows to their original positions in response to a user action (col. 10, lines 32-37 and 63-67).

**As claim 2**, Southgate further teaches user action is selection of one of the windows (col. 9, lines 13-16 and 20-22).

**As claim 3**, Southgate further teaches user action is issuance of a second command (col. 6, lines 58-60).

**As claim 4**, Southgate further teaches including the step of resizing the windows so that all of the windows of said group appear within a defined boundary area of the display in the alternative view (col. 13, lines 23-33).

**As claim 6**, Southgate further teaches group comprises all open primary windows on the display (fig. 5, label 106, 112, 114, 116).

**As claim 7**, Southgate further teaches including the step of repositioning a subset of all open windows, which are related to one another (fig. 5, label 114 and 116), in response to a

second command to present a second alternative view (col. 6, lines 58-60).

**As claim 8**, Southgate further teaches related windows are associated with a common application program (fig. 5, label 106, 112, 114, 116).

**As claim 9**, Southgate further teaches the step of moving all windows out of the area of said display in response to a third command to present a third alternative view (col. 8, lines 14-27).

**As claim 10**, Southgate further teaches including the step of moving all windows out of the area of said display in response to a second command to present a second alternative view (col. 8, lines 14-27).

**As claim 11**, Southgate further teaches group comprises a subset of all open windows on the display, which are related to one another (fig. 5, label 106, 112, 114, 116).

**As claim 12**, Southgate further teaches related windows are associated with a common application program (fig. 5, label 106, 112, 114, 116).

**As claim 13**, Southgate further teaches including the step of repositioning and displaying a different subset of windows that are associated with a different application program (fig. 5, label 106, 112, 114, 116; col. 2, lines 16-21), in response to a predetermined command issued while in the alternative view (col. 6, lines 58-60).

**As claim 15**, Southgate further teaches windows are repositioned in a manner to maintain their relative positions (col. 10, lines 34-37).

**As claim 16**, Southgate further teaches repositioning step includes the steps of: establishing a vector that indicates the relative positions of two overlapping windows, and determining directions of movement for said overlapping windows in accordance with said vector (col. 9, lines 20-28).

**As claim 17**, Southgate further teaches windows are repositioned in an iterative manner, with a direction and amount of movement determined during each iteration (col. 13, lines 13-19).

**As claim 18**, Southgate further teaches each iteration comprises the following steps: determining a direction and amount of movement for each window to be repositioned (col. 9, lines 20-28);
scaling the movement amounts by a moderating factor (col. 14, lines 33-37);
and moving the windows by the scaled amounts (col. 14, lines 33-37) .

**As claim 19**, Southgate further teaches the moderating factor is varied for respective iterations (col. 13, lines 34-40).

**As claim 23**, Southgate further teaches command is initiated by user action (col. 6, lines 58-60).

**As claim 24**, Southgate further teaches user action is actuation of a physical element of a computer system (col. 13, lines 41-45).

**As claim 25**, Southgate inherently teaches user action is positioning of a cursor in a

predetermined area of the display (col. 13, lines 41-45 - It should be recognized that the steps of FIG. 11, while described specifically as an iterative loop, can be implemented in a variety of ways including interrupt-driven routines that handle user input such as mouse repositioning, clicking, etc., in a more efficient manner; wherein the positioning of a cursor predetermine area is the mouse repositioning, clicking, etc).

**As claim 26**, Southgate inherently teaches area is a predetermined corner of the display (col. 13, lines 41-45 - It should be recognized that the steps of FIG. 11, while described specifically as an iterative loop, can be implemented in a variety of ways including interrupt-driven routines that handle user input such as mouse repositioning, clicking, etc., in a more efficient manner; wherein the said area is a predetermined corner of the display is the mouse repositioning, clicking, etc).

**As claim 27**, Southgate further teaches command is issued by a program (col. 3, lines 46-51).

**As claim 28**, Southgate further teaches program issues the command in response to detection of a specified condition (col. 13, lines 41-45).

**As claim 30**, Southgate teaches a computer system (fig. 1; col. 4, lines 51-54), comprising:

a display device (fig. 1, label 3 and 5, col. 4, line 51-53);

a graphical user interface that normally displays a plurality of objects in a layered view (abstract) in which an object can overlap (col. 3, lines 35-36) and obscure at least a portion of another object (col. 3, lines 23-25);
means responsive to a command for repositioning said plurality of objects in an alternative viewing mode (col. 6, lines 58-60) such that said objects appear in respective areas of the display device with the same relative sizes and configurations as in the layered view (col. 3, lines 42-45 and col. 8, lines 6-13), but without overlapping any other objects of said plurality (col. 3, lines 38-42);
and means responsive to a subsequent command for returning said objects to their original positions in said layered view (col. 10, lines 32-37 and 63-67).

**As claim 31**, Southgate further teaches repositioning means comprises a component of an operating system program for said computer system (col. 5, lines 28-35).

**As claim 32**, Southgate further teaches repositioning means is contained in an application program that executes on said computer system (col. 5, lines 28-35).

**As claim 33**, Southgate further teaches repositioning means is contained in a plug-in module that cooperates with an operating system for said computer system (col. 5, lines 28-35).

**As claim 34**, Southgate further teaches objects comprise windows (abstract).

**As claim 35**, Southgate teaches a graphical user interface for a computer (abstract) having a first mode in which plural objects are displayed in a layered environment in positions in

which an object can overlap (col. 3, lines 35-36) and obscure at least some of the contents of another object (col. 3, lines 23-25), and a second mode in which said plural objects are temporarily moved from their positions in said first mode to respective areas (col. 3, lines 38-40) with in a display (col. 3, lines 46-51) such that the content of each of said plural objects is visible without overlap (col. 3, lines 38-42), while maintaining the relative sizes and configurations of said plural objects (col. 3, lines 42-45 and col. 8, lines 6-13), and subsequently returned to the position they occupied in said first mode view (col. 10, lines 32-37 and 63-67).

**As claim 36**, Southgate further teaches objects comprise windows (abstract).

**As claim 37**, Southgate further teaches objects comprise a combination of windows and other user interface elements (fig. 4, label 106, 112, 114,116 and 118 and 130; col. 5, lines 53-58).

**As claim 38**, Southgate teaches a program providing an alternative view (col. 8, lines 14-27) for a computer user interface of the type that presents a normal viewing mode in which plural objects are displayed in a layered environment (abstract) in positions in which an object can overlap (col. 3, lines 35-36) and obscure at least some of the contents of another object (col. 3, lines 23-25), wherein said program causes said plural objects to move from their positions in said normal viewing mode to respective areas (col. 8, lines 14-20) within a display (col. 3, lines 46-51) such that the content of each of said plural objects is visible without overlap (col. 3, lines 38-42) in said alternative viewing mode, while maintaining the relative sizes and configurations of said plural objects (col. 3, lines 42-45 and col. 8, lines 6-13), and then return to their positions in the normal viewing mode (col. 10, lines 32-37 and 63-67).

**As claim 39**, Southgate further teaches objects comprise windows (abstract).

**As claim 40**, Southgate further teaches objects comprise a combination of windows and other user interface elements elements (fig. 4, label 106, 112, 114,116 and 118 and 130; col. 5, lines 53-58).

**As claim 44**, Southgate teaches a method of providing an alternative view of a plurality of overlapping objects on a display for a graphical user interface (abstract), comprising the steps of:

in response to a command to present the alternative view (col. 6, lines 58-60), moving the objects to respective positions on the display so that they appear without overlap (col. 3, lines 38-42);

and returning the objects to their original positions in response to a user action col. 10, lines 32-37 and 63-67).

**As claim 45**, Southgate further teaches the relative sizes of said objects are maintained during said movement and while they are located at said respective positions (col. 10, lines 34-37).

**As claim 46**, Southgate further teaches user action is selection of one of the objects (col. 9, lines 13-16 and 20-22).

**As claim 47**, Southgate further teaches user action is issuance of a second command (col. 6, lines 58-60).

**As claim 48**, Southgate further teaches including the step of resizing the objects so that all of the displayed objects appear within a defined boundary area of the display in the alternative view (col. 13, lines 23-33).

**As claim 50**, Southgate further teaches objects include icons (fig. 3, label 104 and fig. 4, label 13; col. 5, lines 53-59).

**As claim 51**, Southgate further teaches objects include images (col. 7, lines 49).

**As claim 52**, Southgate further teaches objects are repositioned in a manner to maintain their relative positions (col. 10, lines 34-37).

**As claim 53**, Southgate teaches a method of displaying windows in a user interface for a computer (abstract), comprising the steps of:
displaying windows in a layered view where at least one window can overlay another window (col. 3, lines 35-36) and obscure at least a portion of the contents of said other window (col. 3, lines 23-25);
switching to an unlayered view in response to a first command (col. 6, lines 58-60), wherein a predetermined set of windows are displayed without overlap (col. 3, lines 38-42) while maintaining their relative sizes and configurations (col. 3, lines 42-54 and col. 8, lines 6-13); and returning to said layered view in response to a second command (col. 10, lines 32-37 and 63-67).

**As claim 54**, Southgate further teaches set of windows comprises all open windows being displayed (fig. 5, label 106, 112, 114 and 116).

**As claim 55**, Southgate further teaches set consists of all open windows associated with one application program (fig. 5, label 106, 112, 114 and116).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Southgate in view of Brooks (US Patent 6,008,809).

**As claim 20**, Southgate does not teach computing an external force factor to maintain the windows within a boundary area, and adding said force factor to the movement amounts. However, Brooks teaches computing an external force factor to maintain the windows within a boundary area, and adding said force factor to the movement amounts (col. 6, lines 1-9; col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by computing an external force factor to maintain the windows within a boundary area, and adding said force factor to the movement amounts as taught by Brooks in order to ensure the windows are not allowed to crossover a boundary or exceed the

limits of the display screen during a user or program controlled movement and maintaining the windows in the display area (abstract, lines 25-28).

**As claim 21**, Southgate does not teach determining whether the windows lie outside of a defined boundary area after the last iteration, and resizing the windows to fit within said boundary area if they lie outside of the boundary area.
However, Brooks teaches determining whether the windows lie outside of a defined boundary area after the last iteration, and resizing the windows to fit within said boundary area if they lie outside of the boundary area (col. 1, lines 36-49).
Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by determining whether the windows lie outside of a defined boundary area after the last iteration, and resizing the windows to fit within said boundary area if they lie outside of the boundary area as taught by Brooks in order to ensure the windows that have exceeded the boundary of the display screen during a user or program controlled movement are repositioned in the designated display area to allow the contents of the entire window to be viewed.

**As claim 22**, Southgate does not teach adding a border region to each window being repositioned, and repositioning the windows such that the border regions of the windows do not overlap.
However, Brooks teaches adding a border region to each window being repositioned (Abstract, lines 18-22), and repositioning the windows such that the border regions of the windows do not overlap (Abstract, lines 18-22; col. 10, lines 39-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by adding a border region to each window being repositioned, and repositioning the windows such that the border regions of the windows do not overlap as taught by Brooks in order to provide a single layer display ensuring none of the windows are obscured by placing borders around the windows ensuring no overlap so all windows can be displayed in a single layer (tiled) view, enhancing the onscreen display of all windows enabling the user to view data from all windows enhancing the windows working environment by allowing the user to view all available data without having to manipulate the windows that are in the obscured or overlapped view (col. 2, lines 38-40 and 45-48).

14. Claims 29 and 41-43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Southgate in view of Rogers et al. (US Patent 6,133,914), hereinafter "Rogers"

**As claim 29**, Southgate does not teach repositioning step comprises moving said Windows from their original positions to said respective areas over a discernable period of time to create an animation effect.

However, Rogers teaches repositioning step comprises moving said windows from their original positions to said respective areas over a discernable period of time to create an animation effect (fig. 5, col. 8, lines 52-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by repositioning step comprises moving said windows from their original positions to said respective areas over a discernable period of time to create an animation effect as taught by Rogers in order to animate the steps between the initial (overlap) and final (tiled) display configurations over a period of time, so that their changing positions will

be easily noted by the user to give a more user friendly working environment, ensure the user has observed where the window has been relocated to (col. 13, lines 34-37).

**As claim 41**, Southgate teaches a computer-readable medium (fig. 2, label 16; col. 5, lines 10-16) containing a computer program (col. 8, lines 14-27) that is responsive to a predetermined command to execute a sequence of steps that overlap objects on a display to move to respective areas of the display over a discernable period of time such that the content of each of said objects is visible without overlap of any of said objects at the end of said period (col. 6, lines 56-64), and responsive to a subsequent command to return the objects to their overlapping position (col. 10, lines 32-37 and 63-67).

Southgate does not teach a sequence of steps that overlapping objects on a display to move to respective areas of the display over a discernable period of time such that the content of each of said objects is visible without overlap of any of said objects at the end of said period is animated.

However, Rogers teaches the a sequence of steps that overlapping objects on a display to move to respective areas of the display over a discernable period of time such that the content of each of said objects is visible without overlap of any of said objects at the end of said period is animated (fig. 5, col. 8, lines 52- 61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by a sequence of steps that overlapping objects on a display to move to respective areas of the display over a discernable period of time such that the content of each of said objects is visible without overlap of any of said objects at the end of said period is animated as taught by Rogers in order to animate the steps between the initial (overlap) and final (tiled) display configurations over a period of time, so that their changing positions will be

easily noted by the user to give a more user friendly working environment, ensure the user has observed where the window has been relocated to (col. 13, lines 34-37).

**As claim 42**, Southgate further teaches objects comprise windows (abstract).

**As claim 43**, Southgate further teaches objects comprise a combination of windows and other user interface elements (fig. 4, label 106, 112, 114,116 and 118 and 130; col. 5, lines 53-58).

15. Claims 5 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Southgate in view of Mann et al. (US Pub 2004/0212640), hereinafter "Mann"

**As claim 5**, Southgate does not teach all of the repositioned windows are resized according to a common factor to maintain their relative sizes and aspect ratios.
However, Mann teaches all of the repositioned windows are resized according to a common factor to maintain their relative sizes and aspect ratios (par [0088]).
Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by all of the repositioned windows are resized according to a common factor to maintain their relative sizes and aspect ratios as taught by Mann in order to enhance the modified display of windows by displaying the content as it was prior to the action of changing the display options ensuring the information is displayed close to the original state as possible (par [0087]).

**As claim 49**, Southgate does not teach all of the repositioned objects are according to a common factor to maintain their relative sizes.

However, Mann teaches all of the repositioned objects are according to a common factor to maintain their relative sizes (par [0088]).
Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by all of the repositioned objects are according to a common factor to maintain their relative sizes as taught by Mann in order to enhance the modified display of windows by displaying the content as it was prior to the action of changing the display options ensuring the information is displayed close to the original state as possible (par [0087]).

16. Claims 14 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Southgate in view of Bates et al. (US Patent 5,390,295), hereinafter "Bates"

**As claim 14**, Southgate further teaches including the steps of:
detecting a user action indicating selection of one of said repositioned windows, in the alternative view (fig. 10, label 222 and 224; col. 9, lines 11-32);
and returning the windows to their original positions (col. 10, lines 32-37 and 63-67).

Southgate does not teach displaying the selected window in the foreground of the display upon returning the windows to their original positions.
However, Bates teaches displaying the selected window in the foreground of the display (col. 16, lines 53-58) upon returning the windows to their original positions.
Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by displaying the selected window in the foreground of the display upon returning the windows to their original positions as taught by Bates in order to distinctively display the active window and allow the user to input or otherwise manipulate the

data contained in the in focus window, giving the extra benefit of controlling the windows working environment to enhance productivity by alleviating the confusion in working with multiple windows displayed in the central screen area.

**As claim 61**, Southgate teaches a method for displaying windows in a graphical user interface for a computer (abstract), comprising the steps of:
displaying a plurality of windows that are respectively associated with different applications running on the computer (fig. 5, label 106, 112, 114, 116; col. 2, lines 16-21) ;
in response to a command to present an alternative view (col. 6, lines 58-60), repositioning those windows associated with one of said applications (fig. 5, label 106, 112, 114, 116) so that they appear in a respective area of the display without overlap(col. 3, lines 38-42);
and subsequently returning the windows to their original positions in response to a user action (col. 10, lines 32-37 and 63-67).
Southgate does not teach displaying the window in the foreground of the display.
However, Bates teaches displaying the window in the foreground of the display (col. 16, lines 53-58).
Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by displaying the window in the foreground of the display as taught by Bates in order to distinctively display the active window and allow the user to input or otherwise manipulate the data contained in the in focus window, giving the extra benefit of controlling the windows working environment to enhance productivity by alleviating the confusion in working with multiple windows displayed in the central screen area.

17. Claims 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Southgate in view of Duperrouzel et al. (US Patent 6,832,355).

**As claim 56**, Southgate does not teach the step of dragging an object from one of the windows in said set to another of the windows in said set while said unlayered view is being displayed.

However, Duperrouzel teaches the step of dragging an object from one of the windows in said set to another of the windows in said set while said unlayered view is being displayed (fig. 2, label 212a, 212b, 212c and 212d; col. 4, lines 58-60 and col. 11, lines 32-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by dragging an object from one of the windows in said set to another of the windows in said set while said unlayered view is being displayed as taught by Duperrouzel in order to enhance productivity by reducing the amount of time that a windows user requires to manage or transfer data between windows by selectively using the powerful tool/method of drag and drop for moving the data between two specific windows while maintaining control and specific placement of the item in the designated window with ease (col. 11, lines 24-37).

18. Claims 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Southgate in view of Bronson (US Patent 5,305,435).

**As claim 57**, Southgate teaches a method for facilitating interactivity between objects appearing on a desktop and in windows of a computer user interface (abstract), comprising the steps of:

displaying one or more windows in a normal view such that the windows can obscure a user's view of objects on the desktop of the user interface (fig. 4; col. 3, lines 23-25).

Southgate does not teach temporarily removing the windows from their obscuring positions in response to a first user command;

selecting at least one of said desktop objects while the windows are removed returning the windows to their original positions in response to a second command from the user, while maintaining the selection of said desktop object-and placing the selected object in one of said windows.

However, Bronson teaches temporarily removing the windows from their obscuring positions in response to a first user command (col. 7, lines 17-19);

selecting at least one of said desktop objects while the windows are removed (col. 9, lines 10 – 20) returning the windows to their original positions in response to a second command from the user (col. 7, lines 56-66), while maintaining the selection of said desktop object-and placing the selected object in one of said windows (col. 7 , lines 56–59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by temporarily removing the windows from their obscuring positions in response to a first user command; selecting at least one of said desktop objects while the windows are removed returning the windows to their original positions in response to a second command from the user, while maintaining the selection of said desktop object-and placing the selected object in one of said windows as taught by Bronson in order to leave the central screen area clear of non-active windows by removing the windows in an obscuring position and moving them to a virtual or non-visible area leaving the central screen area for displaying windows with an active display status, so the user able to select a window, maintain control by dragging the window onto the display and placing the window on the desktop, giving

the extra benefit of controlling the windows working environment to enhance productivity by alleviating the confusion in working with multiple windows displayed in the central screen area (col. 2, lines 15-22).

**As claim 58**, Southgate does not teach temporarily removing the windows comprises the steps of displaying a border area along at least one edge of the desktop area, and moving the windows to positions within said border area.

However, Bronson teaches temporarily removing the windows comprises the steps of displaying a border area along at least one edge of the desktop area (fig. 7, label 38), and moving the windows to positions within said border area (col. 3, lines 43-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by temporarily removing the windows comprises the steps of displaying a border area along at least one edge of the desktop area, and moving the windows to positions within said border area as taught by Bronson in order to leave the central screen area clear of non-active windows and to reserve the central screen area for displaying windows with an active display status and place the non-active windows in the border area, so to provide the user with a working environment to enhance productivity by alleviating the confusion in working with multiple windows displayed in the central screen area (col. 2, lines 15-22).

**As claim 59**, Southgate does not teach returning the windows is initiated by dragging the selected desktop object to said border area.

However, Bronson teaches returning the windows is initiated by dragging the selected desktop object to said border area (col. 3, lines 43-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by returning the windows is initiated by dragging the selected

desktop object to said border area as taught by Bronson in order to give the user the ability to selectively clear the central screen area of non-active windows to provide the user with a working environment to enhance productivity by alleviating the confusion in working with multiple windows displayed in the central screen area (col. 2, lines 15-22).

**As claim 60**, Southgate teaches a method for facilitating interactivity between objects appearing on a desktop and in windows of a computer user interface (abstract), comprising the steps of:

displaying one or more windows in a normal view such that the windows can obscure a user's view of objects on the desktop of the user interface (fig. 4; col. 3, lines 23-25).

Southgate does not teach selecting an object in a window;

temporarily removing the windows from their obscuring positions in response to a first user command, while maintaining the selection of the object;

placing the selected object on the desktop or a desktop object while the windows are removed;

and returning the windows to their original positions in response to a second command from the user.

However, Bronson teaches selecting an object in a window (col. 9, lines 10 – 20);

temporarily removing the windows from their obscuring positions in response to a first user command (col. 7, lines 17-19), while maintaining the selection of the object;

placing the selected object on the desktop or a desktop object while the windows are removed (col. 7 , lines 56-59);

and returning the windows to their original positions in response to a second command from the user (col. 7,lines 56-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate by temporarily removing the windows from their obscuring positions in response to a first user command, while maintaining the selection of the object; placing the selected object on the desktop or a desktop object while the windows are removed; and returning the windows to their original positions in response to a second command from the user as taught by Bronson in order to leave the central screen area clear of non-active windows and to reserve the central screen area for displaying windows with an active display status, so the user is able to select a window, maintain control by dragging the selected window to the screen edge and placing the window in a virtual or non-visible screen area, giving the extra benefit of controlling the windows working environment to enhance productivity by alleviating the confusion in working with multiple windows displayed in the central screen area (col. 2, lines 15-22 and col. 8, lines 39-44).

19. Claims 62, 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Southgate in view of Bates and further in view of Ward, III et al. (US Pub 2002/0073424), hereinafter "Ward"

**As claim 62**, Southgate and Bates do not teach dimming the appearance of the windows associated with the applications other than said one application.
However, Ward teaches dimming the appearance of the windows associated with the applications other than said one application (par [0030]).
Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate and Bates by dimming the appearance of the windows associated with the applications other than said one application as taught by Ward in order to

enhance the multiple window working environment to allow the user to focus on the active window alleviating the confusion and more productive when in working with multiple windows in the displayed ([0009]).

**As claim 63**, Southgate further teaches one application is the application that is active when said command is issued (col. 3, lines 46-51).

**As claim 64**, Southgate further teaches in response to another user action during the time that said windows associated with said one application are repositioned, of: repositioning those windows associated with second application (col. 8, lines 14-20) so that they appear in a respective area of the display without overlap (col. 3, lines 38-42). And Bates teaches displaying the window in the foreground of the display (col. 16, lines 53-58). Southgate and Bates do not teach dimming the windows associated with said one application. However, Ward teaches dimming the windows associated with said one application (par [0030]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southgate and Bates by dimming the windows associated with said one application as taught by Ward in order to enhance the multiple window working environment to allow the user to focus on the active window alleviating the confusion and more productive when in working with multiple windows in the displayed ([0009]).

## *Conclusion*

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Southgate (US Patent 5,487,143) – Computer user interface having tiled and overlapped window areas.

Rogres et al. (US Patent 6,133,914) – Interactive graphical user interface.

Bronson (US Patent 5,305,435) – Computer windows management system and method for simulating off-screen document storage and retrieval.

Bates et al. (US Patent 5,390,295) – Method and apparatus for proportionally displaying windows on a computer display screen.

Mann et al. (US Pub 2004/0212640) – System and method for providing dynamic user information in an interactive display.

Brooks (US Patent 6,008,809) – Apparatus and method for viewing multiple windows within a dynamic window.

Ward, III et al. (US Pub 2002/0073424) – System and method for modifying advertisement responsive to EPG information.

Duperrouzel et al. (US Patent 6,832,355) – Web page display system.

Duperrouzel et al. (US Patent 7,032,007) – Apparatus and method for monitoring

Destefano (US Paten 6,0775,531) – Computer system and method of manipulating multiple graphical user interface components on a computer display with a proximity pointer.

Leong et at. (US Patent 5,513,342) – Display windown layout system that automactically accommodates changes in displaying resolution, font size and national language.

Cohn (US Patent 5,712,995) – Non-overlapping tiling apparatus and method for multiple window displays.

Kelley et al. (US Patent 6,636,244) – Pointing device selection method.

Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,692,143) – Method and system for recalling desktop states in a data processing system.

Tabata et al. (US Patent 4,574,364) – Method and apparatus for controlling image display.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Carleton whose telephone number is 571-270-1258. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30 AM -5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thuy Carleton

N. El-Hady

NABIL M. EL-HADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER